

COUNTY OF SUFFOLK



EDWARD P. ROMAINE
SUFFOLK COUNTY EXECUTIVE

CHRISTOPHER J. CLAYTON
COUNTY ATTORNEY

DEPARTMENT OF LAW

Via ECF

June 2, 2025

Hon. Gary R. Brown
United States District Judge
Eastern District of New York
100 Federal Plaza
Central Islip, New York 11722

Re: *McGregor v. Suffolk County, et al.*, 23-cv-1130 (GRB)(ARL)

Dear Judge Brown:

On May 29, 2025, Defendants County of Suffolk, Suffolk County Police Commissioner Rodney Harrison, and Suffolk County Police Lieutenant Michael Komorowski (collectively “County Defendants”) filed, as a bundle motion, their cross-motion for summary judgment as Docket Entry (“DE”) No. 101; it was comprised of DE Nos. 101-1 through DE 101-23. Previously, Plaintiffs had filed, as a bundle motion, their motion for summary judgment as DE Nos. 91, 92, 93, 98, and 99.¹

In compiling hard copies of DE No. 101 for provision as a courtesy copy to the Court, the County Defendants became aware that they had failed to file an exhibit in support of Plaintiffs’ opposition to the County Defendants’ summary judgment motion, the exhibit in question being the Declaration of Edward Newman, dated April 28, 2024 (“the Newman Declaration”). Plaintiffs had previously efiled the Newman Declaration with the Court as DE No. 91-17 in support of their motion for summary judgment.

¹ Plaintiff’s bundle-filing consisted of the following: DE No. 91 (Plaintiffs’ summary judgment motion), DE No. 92 (the State Intervenor’s Opposition thereto), DE No. 93 (Plaintiff’s Reply to the State Intervenor’s Opposition), DE 98 (the County’s Opposition to the Plaintiff’s summary judgment motion)), and DE No. DE 99 (Plaintiffs’ reply to the County Defendants’ opposition).

LOCATION

H. LEE DENNISON BLDG.

100 VETERANS MEMORIAL HIGHWAY

MAILING ADDRESS

P.O. BOX 6100

HAUPPAUGE, NY 11788-0099

(631) 853-4049

TELECOPIER (631) 853-5169

As discussed in a phone conversation with the Court's law clerk, the County Defendants, rather than refiling and reprinting their summary judgment motion, are by this letter notifying the Court about their failure to file the Newman Declaration, which can be readily accessed electronically at DE 91-17. In addition, the County Defendants will include DE 91-17 in the courtesy copy of their summary with an explanation that the Newman Declaration should, in addition to being efiled in DE 91, have been efiled as part of DE 101.

The County Defendants thank the Court for its consideration and courtesies.

Very truly yours,

Christopher J. Clayton
Suffolk County Attorney

/s/ Anne C. Leahey

By: Anne C. Leahey
Assistant County Attorney